



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,300	02/06/2004	Soren M. Hansen	606-60-PA	5448

7590 01/13/2006

Howard J. Klein
Klein, O'Neill & Singh, LLP
Suite 510
2 Park Plaza
Irvine, CA 92614

EXAMINER

PARSLEY, DAVID J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3643

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/774,300

Applicant(s)

HANSEN, SOREN M.

Examiner

David J. Parsley

Art Unit

3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

Amendment

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendment dated 11-23-05 and this action is final.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,099,400 to Ragnarsson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,112,269 to Petersen and U.S. Patent No. 4,517,707 to Braginsky et al.

Referring to claim 1, Ragnarsson et al. discloses a method of preparing shrimps, comprising the following steps of boiling the shrimps at an elevated temperature exceeding the boiling temperature of water at the atmospheric pressure for a specific period of time for keeping the meat of the shrimps in a compressed state – see for example at 1 and column 1 lines 40-60 and column 2 lines 22-60, rapidly cooling the shrimps to a temperature at or below the atmospheric temperature for causing substantially all meat of the shrimps to be separated from the shells of the shrimps between an area behind the head of the individual shrimp and a part above the tail of the individual shrimp – see at 2, 11 and 12 and for example column 1 lines 34-67 and column 2 lines 1-67, peeling the shrimps by mechanically opening the shells of the shrimps for allowing the meat loosely contained within the shells of the shrimps to fall out from the shells of the shrimps – see for example at 3-5, separating the meat of the shrimps from the remains of the shrimps, including the shell parts and any eggs by introducing the meat and the remains into a liquid such as a brine solution, including a specific amount of salt/sodium chloride by weight – see for example at 12 and column 2 lines 46-67, column 3 lines 1-67 and column 4 lines 1-47 and then removing the meat from the separation liquid – see for example column 2 lines 46-67, column 3 lines 1-67 and column 4 lines 1-47.

Ragnarsson et al. does not disclose steam boiling the shrimps at a high pressure exceeding the atmospheric pressure. Petersen does disclose steam boiling the shrimps at a high pressure exceeding the atmospheric pressure – see for example column 2 lines 4-63. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Ragnarsson et al. and add the steam boiling of the shrimp at high pressure of Petersen, so as to allow for the shrimp to be removed from their shells without losing juice and taste from the shrimp meat.

Ragnarsson et al. further does not disclose flotation separation of the meat from the shell remains by causing the meat to float on the separation liquid while allowing the remains of the shrimps including the shell parts and any eggs to sink. Braginsky et al. does disclose separating the meat of the shrimps from the remains of the shrimps including the shell parts and any eggs by flotation separation of the meat from the remains by introducing the meat and the remains into a separation liquid such as a brine solution including a specific amount of sodium chloride by weight— see at 9 and 35 and column 4 lines 64-68, for causing the meat to float on the separation liquid while allowing the remains of the shrimps including the shell parts and any eggs to sink and then removing the meat from the separation liquid – see for example figures 1-5, column 4 lines 63-68 and column 5 lines 1-68 and column 6 lines 1-30. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Ragnarsson et al. and add the flotation separation of Braginsky et al., so as to allow for the processing of the shrimp and their respective shells to be increased to thus increase the throughput of the process/device.

Referring to claim 2, Ragnarsson et al. as modified by Petersen and Braginsky et al. further discloses the pressure being in the range of 4-20 bar – see for example column 2 lines 3-11 of Petersen.

Referring to claim 3, Ragnarsson et al. as modified by Petersen and Braginsky et al. further discloses the temperature being in the range of 150-250°C – see for example column 2 lines 3-11 of Petersen.

Referring to claim 4, Ragnarsson et al. as modified by Petersen and Braginsky et al. further disclose the specific period of time for the heating and pressurizing step being less than 20 seconds – see for example column 2 lines 4-11 and column 3 lines 47-65 of Petersen.

Referring to claim 5, Ragnarsson et al. as modified by Petersen and Braginsky et al. further discloses the temperature in the cooling step being in the range of 0-20°C – see for example column 2 lines 47-60 of Ragnarsson et al.

Referring to claim 6, Ragnarsson et al. as modified by Petersen and Braginsky et al. further disclose the boiling being performed in a pressurized boiler in a continuous operation – see for example column 2 lines 21-47 of Ragnarsson et al. and column 3 lines 35-65 of Petersen.

Referring to claim 7, Ragnarsson et al. as modified by Petersen and Braginsky et al. further discloses the boiling being performed in a pressurized boiler in an intermittent batch operation – see at 13 and 31 in figure 1 of Petersen.

Referring to claim 9, Ragnarsson et al. as modified by Petersen and Braginsky et al. does not disclose the aqueous solution of sodium chloride contains 6-14% by weight of sodium chloride. However, applicant does not state in the specification any particular that the use of sodium chloride at 6-14% by weight is done for any particular purpose or to solve any particular problem over that of the prior art and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Ragnarsson et al. as modified by Petersen and Braginsky et al. and add the aqueous solution containing 6-14% by weight of sodium chloride, so as to allow for the shrimp to be preserved and maintain the flavor of the shrimp meat during processing.

Referring to claim 10, Ragnarsson et al. as modified by Petersen and Braginsky et al. further discloses forcedly introducing the peeled shrimps into the separation liquid along with the shell parts and any eggs – see for example column 5 lines 33-68 of Braginsky et al.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ragnarsson et al. as modified by Petersen and Braginsky et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of

Art Unit: 3643

U.S. Patent No. 3,818,818 to Hice. Ragnarsson et al. as modified by Petersen and Braginsky et al. does not disclose the cooling is performed by a water-cooling bath. Hice does disclose the cooling is performed by a water-cooling bath – see for example – at 100 and 102 in figure 2 and column 4 lines 60-66. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Ragnarsson et al. as modified by Petersen and Braginsky et al. and add the water bath cooling means of Hice, so as to allow for temperature of the objects in the bath to be quickly reduced to facilitate further processing of the objects.

Response to Arguments

4. Regarding claims 1-10, the Ragnarsson et al. reference US 6099400 discloses the process steps of cooking the shrimp, cooling the shrimp and peeling the shrimp as seen in paragraph 3 above. The Ragnarsson et al. does not disclose the cooking of the shrimp is done by steam boiling at a high pressure. The Petersen et al. reference US 5112269 does disclose cooking shrimp by steam boiling – see for example column 2 lines 4-63. Therefore the combination of the Ragnarsson et al. and Petersen et al. references renders the claimed invention obvious given the motivation to combine the references given above in paragraph 3 of this office action. Applicant argues that the Ragnarsson et al. and Petersen et al. references both do not disclose cooking the shrimp at a temperature above 150⁰C. However, the specific cooking temperature is not claimed and thus this argument is moot. Further, applicant argues that the Petersen et al. reference cannot be properly combined with the Ragnarsson et al. since the Petersen et al. reference teaches separating the meat of the shrimp from the shells of the shrimp without the use of a transport

liquid. However, the Petersen et al. reference is only used to teach the steam boiling of the shrimp and not the separating of the meat of the shrimp from the shells of the shrimp and therefore this argument is moot. Further, the Ragnarsson et al. reference discloses floating the shrimp in a brine solution – see at 12 in figure 1 where the brine is introduced to item 12 from item 15 as seen in figure 1. Ragnarsson et al. does not disclose the brine solution is used to separate the meat of the shrimp from the shells of the shrimp. The Braginsky et al. reference US 4517707 does disclose separating the meat of the shrimp from the shells of the shrimp via flotation separation in a liquid comprising brine – see for example at 9 and 35 and column 4 lines 64-68 and see for example figures 1-5, and column 5 lines 1-68 and column 6 lines 1-30. Therefore, it is deemed that the combination of the Ragnarsson et al. reference as modified by the Petersen et al. reference with the Braginsky et al. reference discloses the claimed invention given the motivation to combine the references found in paragraph 3 above in this office action. Applicant further argues that the Braginsky et al. reference uses a flow of the liquid to facilitate the separation of the meat of the shrimp from the shell of the shrimp, which is different from the claimed invention which does not need liquid flow to facilitate the separation. However, the flow of the liquid or lack thereof is not claimed and therefore this argument is moot.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. Parsley whose telephone number is (571) 272-6890. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on (571) 272-6891. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/774,300

Page 9

Art Unit: 3643

DP

David Parsley
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3643

Pat m Pm

RECEIVED
U.S. PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE
10/11/06

1/11/06